



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Britain and her great self-governing dominions will fall to statesmen standing for a different order of ideas.

Excellent maps, diagrams, and tables are provided.

D. A. MACGIBBON

BRANDON COLLEGE
BRANDON, MANITOBA

Social Adaptation: A Study in the Development of the Doctrine of Adaptation as a Theory of Social Progress. By LUCIUS MOODY BRISTOL. (Harvard Economic Studies, XIV.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1915. 8vo, pp. xii+356. \$2.00.

This study is an attempt to use the history of sociology in the nineteenth century in illustration of the category of adaptation as the cause and measure of social progress. The writer divides adaptation into four aspects. The first is passive physical adaptation or the notion of biological evolution. Under this head he discusses the work of Lamarck, Darwin, Weismann, de Vries, and Mendel. Under the same aspect he discusses also the neo-Darwinian sociologists: Nietzsche, Kidd, Galton, Pearson, and Lapouge, as well as the Environmental school: Marx, Buckle, Ratzel-Semple, and Ripley.

The second aspect of adaptation is the passive spiritual involving the evolution of psychic and social factors, the process of education, and the idea of genetic social control. Under this aspect he discusses the development of the concept of society as an organism by Schaeffle (Spencer having been discussed in an earlier chapter under the title of "Cosmic Evolution"), Mackenzie, Le Bon, Durkheim, and others; the anthropological sociologists: Sumner, Boas, Hobhouse, Westermatch, and Thomas; the historical sociologists: Gumplowicz, Ratzenhoffer, and Bagehot; sociologists emphasizing one all-important formula or principle: Adam Smith, Tarde, Baldwin, Drummond, and Giddings.

The third and fourth aspects are active material and active spiritual adaptation. Under the former are included Ward, Patten, and Carver; under the latter, Novicow, Carlyle, James, and Ross. Comte, Quetelet, Lilienfeld, and De Greef are discussed in an introductory section as establishing the method and the limits, so far attained, of sociology.

Mr. Bristol's speculations have their point of departure in Professor Carver's economic nationalism. According to this proposition, that group will be fit to survive, and will survive, which succeeds in controlling its environment better than any other group, is better organized than any other, and knows of no other standards of morality except group

success. A group so organized will be a super-group, will be able to control or destroy any other group, and will thereby inherit the Kingdom of Heaven. This conception is currently known as "Kultur."

Mr. Bristol objects to this theory on the following grounds: it is too logical and abstract; it concerns itself too much with long runs; it is built too rigidly on a promise of neo-Darwinism—not an altogether safe promise; it places too much emphasis on the sovereignty of the group, and neglects altogether the attitude of the individual and the value of his motives; the psychological analyses are not satisfactory; it does not leave sufficient room for rational imitation and race-stock improvement through social control and, finally, the appeal to biblical sanction is questionable.

To save the individual from being altogether crushed in this scheme of economic nationalism, the author sets up a theory of social personalism. Just as mind is superior to matter, he says, so reflective creation and personal affection are the highest forms of emotional and intellectual activity, but since both of these are characteristics of the individual and not of the group, the organization of group interests must be carried on with due reference to the individual. There is no danger that such a standard will lead to selfishness, since the individual is socially determined and cannot find true happiness except in social adaptation. The highest form of happiness, says the author, is only to be achieved "in the consciousness that the individual life is unfolding in harmony with the cosmic order or the divine will, i.e., in religious adaptation."

To achieve such a purpose, i.e., social personalism, Mr. Bristol sets up the concept of group personality functioning on an analogy of individual personality, socially determined. Just as each individual seeks to become a member of a larger whole, so must every group conceive as its purpose the functioning in a larger group. A second prerequisite would be the functioning of every group in such a manner as to attract others and stimulate other groups to imitate it.

It is difficult to get much meaning out of a conception such as that of social personalism. It is too much of an analogy, a speculation, or a pious wish to form a workable concept in social science. One surely cannot take exception to it; it is good enough for what it is good for. As an answer to Professor Carver's economic nationalism it is not adequate, as it fails to realize the nature of conflicting class interests within a given group living under the modern competitive régime. I do not know whether Mr. Bristol intended in this study to do anything else than canvass modern sociology from the standpoint of adaptation.

That much he has done well, supplying us besides with a very readable sketch of the history of sociology. For that we are grateful to him. His speculations on other heads are earnestly put forth and make good reading.

MAX SYLVIVS HANDMAN

CHICAGO

The Law and the Practice of Municipal Home Rule. By HOWARD LEE MCBAIN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. Royal 8vo, pp. xviii+724. \$5.00 net.

In 1875, under the irresistible influence of the widely felt disgust with the evils of the general-charter system and of special and class charters as well, Missouri incorporated in its new constitution the first of the provisions for municipal home rule. Since that time eleven other states have adopted in some form the principle of local freedom in the matter of framing city charters, and nearly a hundred and fifty cities have availed themselves of this freedom. The experience, therefore, of four decades, with a wide variety of statutes and charters and a long series of court decisions, has been demanding analysis and criticism. Nevertheless the discussions of "home rule" have been heretofore largely polemical and scarcely at all concerned with actual practices and problems. The few investigations of the latter character have yielded a chapter or two in the general treatises on municipal government or on the law of municipal corporations, and a number of magazine articles. Some of this literature is very good, but it is fragmentary and scattered and much of it is unavailable for many readers.

The service which Professor McBain has rendered by merely gathering all the present information in one place would be sufficient to command our gratitude even were the work not so excellently done as it is. Our confidence in the author is immediately engaged by the spirit in which he has undertaken his task. Without sentiment with regard to local self-government, but assuming the general desirability of municipal home rule, he has set himself to discover and "set forth the net governmental results of home rule in the states in which it has been put into operation" in order "that the actual relation in law between the city as an autonomous unit and the state government as its restricted superior may be comprehended." The volume before us is therefore, as its title implies, a treatise on a division of public law. But it is intended less for the lawyer than for the student of government, the reformer, the public-spirited layman. In this connection it is to be regretted